

SENATOR MURPHY: Addressing myself to the new interpretation of what this amendment is, an example cited by Senator Brennan. If that man did, in fact, come back to his former employment and was, subsequently, laid off, then there certainly should be no exempt period of time if he is laid off. Now if he comes back to his employer and voluntarily takes a walk, then most certainly he should. But an employee who is laid off, Senator Brennan, does not have the seven week exemption. Does he? I thought that applied only to voluntary or forecaused dismissals.

SENATOR BRENNAN: He voluntarily quit in Kansas, so he's disqualified for whatever time they give him, seven to ten, some people have to wait 15 to 25. It doesn't pay to go out and find a temporary job. A lot of times it just doesn't pay. Leaves you with nothing to do. Some people don't understand there is some unemployment.

SENATOR MURPHY: If a man was initially laid off when his original contractor ran out of work or material, and subsequently was laid off again, I certainly would think he would not have to suffer the disqualification that we've set out in the law.

SENATOR BRENNAN: I think I've mentioned about three different hearings. I wouldn't mind laying this thing over and I'll go to the Labor Department with you, and if I'm wrong I'll pull my amendment.

SENATOR MURPHY: Fine.

SENATOR SAVAGE: Chair recognizes Senator Keyes.

SENATOR KEYES: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to oppose the Brennan amendment. I'll oppose any amendment that comes on this bill. I oppose this bill. Anytime that you are going to take unemployment compensation, either get it out of compliance with the federal regulations, or get it out of compliance with what we do here in the state I want you to know one thing that unemployment compensation, and I have not heard but one man who has ever been employed has worked at a job and has worked at a union contract or anything talk this morning. But if we are going to say to that man who is unemployed, no matter what the reason, if we are going to say to that man that he doesn't have a check, has no way of going home and buying groceries for his family for seven weeks or nine weeks, I care not how he got laid off. We have an obligation to feed the people of this state. Anytime you're going to come up here and say to the people you cannot get unemployment compensation for ten weeks or seven weeks, or four weeks, let me tell you something friends, we either do this, we either keep this act in effect and if it is bad, as Senator Schmit says, and if there is parts of this that is wrong and an abuse of it, let's correct the abuse. Let's not go in and make the man that's unemployed ineligible for something to keep him and his family alive. I just can't understand what you're trying to do. If unemployment isn't working, I wish Senator Schmit was here, if unemployment isn't working, compensation isn't working in David City, why don't he go to the administrators office and correct it. We have a system that has worked for many years, and it will continue to work. But if we say to the people who are out of work you don't have a job, you don't have an unemployment check coming, and you either get a job, and perhaps you can't handle the job, I don't know why, but for goodness sakes let's correct the inequities that exist and not just put the people on a starvation diet.